Paradigms in word-formation

The paradigm in WF is a ‘network of patterns of relationships’, where the content of rule patterns may be highly specific, while their structure remains abstract enough to be applicable to synchronous WF (Beecroo 2004).

The rule patterns in a word-formation paradigm are of conceptual-schematic and formal relations and analogy/paradigm (near/identity types).

The conceptually-schematic relations are based on linguistic schematic encoding of persistent conceptual categories conceptual determined by the ontological types: “THING QUALITY QUANTITY PLACE TIME STATE PROCESS EVENT ACTION RELATION MANNER” (Cruse 2000: 49). Not all possible relations are actualized in a paradigm, only those that are triggered by “pragmatic pressure” (Booij and Lieber 2004: 36).

These are based on different profiles of a progressives frame (Barsalou and Hale 1993).

Each actualised lexeme out of the set of potential words represents a uniquely profiled portion of a scene/frame. (1) a. A word sense’s semantic frame (what the word means or evokes)

b. A word sense’s profile: what the word designates, asserts, negates.

c. A word sense’s background frame: what the word takes for granted, presupposes” (Goldberg 2010: 40).

WF paradigms result as a correlation between potential, possible and actual words.

WF paradigms are open, expandable and of varying degrees of specificity.

For explaining the uniformity of CVs in English the boundary between compounding and affixation needs to be conceived of as permeable and fuzzy.

Paradigms in word-formation

462 compound verbs (CVs) from English

Lamberty and Schmid (2013: 591) - “speakers of English apparently do not have a productive schema for the creation of genuine verbal compounds at their disposal”, yet they are exposed to such compounds and process them and create them with ease.

3 derivational processes involved:

1. Back formation: to babysit – babysitting
2. Conversion: to brownbag ... brown bag
3. Composition proper: to kick start, to sleep-talk

As a compound verb schema is missing in English, speakers deploy “different processing strategies […] trying to take recourse to basic possible base nouns or adjectives and interpreting meanings on the basis of analogies to similar lexical items in the network” (ibid.).

II. Frame re-profiling compound verbs (FRCVs) – e.g. speed date, gift-wrap, husband-hunt, blow-dry, rough-dry, etc. (associated with back-formation and compounding)

A. subtypes:

1. A.1.3. paradigm highlighting
2. A.1.4. manner/effect highlighting

name-drop, stage-manage
striry, rough-dry

B. Frame elaborative/meaning-based (including word nests/series)

gift wrapping — gift wrap — gift wrapping — gift wrapper... — gift wrapped

C. Analogy-based, i.e. proportional equation between target and model based on compound-internal relations — e.g., big fish: X fish = big fish: small fish (X = small); eyewitness: X witness = ear witness; speed date: X date = adjective is established, parasythetic adjectives correlate with collocations, not with corresponding nouns or verbs as they are formed via inversion (Brömser 1985). None of the adjectives record-breaking; mouth-watering; thought-provoking; slow-moving; far-reaching; time-saving; forward-thinking; man-eating; hand-carved; computer-based, etc. is associated with a corresponding CV, though they have a corresponding compound noun, e.g. good-follower, record-breaker, time-saver, etc. with the common semantics of ‘bearer of quality X’.

An explanation can be sought in relation to: a) blocking effects (the existence of verb compound constructions with identical meaning, e.g. to look good, to break the record); b) the nature of the paradigm rule generating the paradigm (only form and analogy-based paradigms in compound adjectives) and c) purely conceptual constraints (relating to profiling alternatives from a relational source).

Paradigms in word-formation

The paradigm in WF is a ‘network of patterns of relationships’, where the content of rule patterns may be highly specific, while their structure remains abstract enough to be applicable to synchronous WF (Beecroo 2004).

The rule patterns in a word-formation paradigm are of conceptual-schematic and formal relations and analogy/paradigm (near/identity types).

The analogy-based paradigms have been defined as derivational series or a set of lexemes analogically formed.

The conceptual-semantic relations are based on linguistic schematic encoding of persistent conceptual categories conceptual determined by the ontological types: “THING QUALITY QUANTITY PLACE TIME STATE PROCESS EVENT ACTION RELATION MANNER” (Cruse 2000: 49). Not all possible relations are actualized in a paradigm, only those that are triggered by “pragmatic pressure” (Booij and Lieber 2004: 36).

These are based on different profiles of a progressives frame (Barsalou and Hale 1993).

Each actualised lexeme out of the set of potential words represents a uniquely profiled portion of a scene/frame. (1) a. A word sense’s semantic frame (what the word means or evokes)

b. A word sense’s profile: what the word designates, asserts, negates.

c. A word sense’s background frame: what the word takes for granted, presupposes” (Goldberg 2010: 40).

WF paradigms result as a correlation between potential, possible and actual words.

WF paradigms are open, expandable and of varying degrees of specificity.

For explaining the uniformity of CVs in English the boundary between compounding and affixation needs to be conceived of as permeable and fuzzy.
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Types of paradigms

350). These are based on different paradigmatic relations conditioned by the source, which makes WF paradigms different from inflectional paradigms.

Paradigmatic relations are ones in absentia and result from “cumulative patterns” (Bochner 1993). The consistency and extendibility of word-formation paradigms in compounding stem from the polysemies of the -ing and the -ed-formatives (Hillpert 2015) and the “flexible ‘type-token’, degrammaramtical part of speech system in English” (Voigl 2000). Analogly and the ubiquity of conversion in English are indispensable in this process.

Reduced extendibility is also associated with morphological relations in Bulgarian: e.g., krâvodaryavanè (giving) to krâvodary (giving), krâvodariant (giving) (in all three types) but dâbokomile (grave) to dâbokomile (grave) (dâbokomiletelen).

This raises serious questions regarding the typology of paradigmatic relations conditioned by the source, which is why WF paradigms differ from inflectional paradigms.

Cross-linguistic research in the typology of paradigmatic relations in compounding will shed light on the possibility of different paradigmatic patterning in affixation and compounding – a promising venue for further research.
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